

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the Office action mailed on December 22, 2003 in connection with the above-identified patent application is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Prior to entry of the above amendments, claims 1-19 were pending, with claims 1 and 3-9 rejected and claims 2 and 10-19 withdrawn from consideration after entry of Applicant's response to the Restriction Requirement issued on November 7, 2003. By the above amendments, claims 1, 6, and 8-9 are amended, claims 12-19 are cancelled without prejudice as they are directed to non-elected species, and new claims 20-28 are added.

Special Circumstances

In the Office action mailed December 22, 2003, the Examiner asked Applicant to point out any material information from the co-pending applications listed as parents to the instant application if the criteria for materiality applies and if the examination record provides reason for Applicant to believe that the Examiner has not considered such information. Applicant is uncertain what the Examiner is requesting. Applicant has previously identified the applications and believes that identification satisfies its duty of disclosure. Nevertheless, in an attempt to respond to the request, Applicant has attached to the end of this document as "Attachment 1" a list of its patent applications and its one Taiwanese patent (the list does not include the national phase filings of the listed PCT application). None of the listed applications have yet issued as patents, although some claims in some applications have been allowed. The Examiner is requested to inform Applicant if further information concerning any of these applications is needed.

Double Patenting

The Examiner stated: "It should be noted that for the purpose of this office action the below rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 (double patenting) are being made under the assumption that the applications were not commonly owned at the time of applicant's invention." (Office Action, 2.) Applicant is uncertain what the Examiner means by this statement. The double patenting rejections set forth in the Office Action were made under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, not under 35 U.S.C. 101, so applicant does not understand why reference was made to that statute. Additionally, as far as applicant is aware, obviousness-type double patenting rejections are made between commonly owned applications so applicant does not understand why the assumption was made that the applications were not commonly owned. The Examiner is requested to inform applicant if further information concerning these points is needed.

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1 and 3-9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 4-8 and 14-18 of co-pending Application No. 10/215,929, claims 1, 12, and 16-17 of co-pending Application No. 10/146,527, claims 1-5, 8, 14, 16-17, 19-22, 24-27, 30 and 32-34 of co-pending Application No. 09/929,240, and claims 1-3, 5-6, and 12-14 of co-pending Application No. 09/929,237. These rejections are traversed.

Claims 1, 4-8, and 14-18 of co-pending Application No. 10/215,929, as published, do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 3-9 of the present application and therefore the co-pending application cannot render the present claims obvious. MPEP §2143.03. In any event, this rejection is or will be moot because

applicant is letting the cited co-pending application go abandoned in favor of a continuation application.

Claims 1, 12, and 16-17 of co-pending Application No. 10/146,527, as published, also do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 3-9 of the present application and therefore the co-pending application cannot render the present claims obvious. MPEP §2143.03. Specifically, the cited claims of the co-pending application fail to disclose or suggest a safety brake system configured to detect contact, a cartridge removably coupled to a support frame, or a single-use component mounted in the cartridge. It should be noted that the disclosure of the co-pending application cannot be used in an obviousness type double patenting rejection. The MPEP explains that “[w]hen considering whether the invention defined in a claim of an application is an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of a patent, the disclosure of the patent may not be used as prior art.” MPEP §804 at 800-22.

Claims 1-5, 8, 14, 16-17, 19-22, 24-27, 30 and 32-34 of co-pending Application No. 09/929,240, as published, also do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 3-9 of the present application and therefore the co-pending application cannot render the present claims obvious. MPEP §2143.03. In any event, a number of the cited claims of the co-pending application have been or will be amended or cancelled without prejudice, and as a result, this double patenting rejection may now be or may become moot. In light of these facts, applicant requests that the discussion of this obviousness-type double patenting rejection be postponed pending resolution of the remaining issues discussed herein. If the remaining issues are resolved, then applicant requests that the

double patenting rejection be withdrawn so that the application may proceed to issuance.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 12-14 of co-pending Application No. 09/929,237, as published, also do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 3-9 of the present application and therefore the co-pending application cannot render the present claims obvious. MPEP §2143.03. Specifically, the cited claims of the co-pending application fail to disclose or suggest a safety brake system configured to detect contact, a cartridge removably coupled to a support frame, or a single-use component mounted in the cartridge. It should be noted that the disclosure of the co-pending application cannot be used in an obviousness type double patenting rejection. The MPEP explains that “[w]hen considering whether the invention defined in a claim of an application is an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of a patent, the disclosure of the patent may not be used as prior art.” MPEP §804 at 800-22.

In light of these comments, applicant requests that the obviousness-type double patenting rejections be withdrawn.

Statement Under 37 C.F.R. 1.78(c)

The Examiner required applicant under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) and 37 C.F.R. 1.78(c) to state whether the inventions claimed in the applications cited as the bases for the double patenting rejections were commonly owned at the time the invention claimed in the present application was made. In response, SD3, LLC states that the inventions claimed in the present application and in the co-pending applications cited by the Examiner were commonly owned or subject to an obligation of assignment to SD3, LLC at the time each later invention was made. The undersigned is authorized to make this

statement on behalf of SD3, LLC. By making this statement Applicant does not concede that the cited claims are conflicting claims, that the double patenting rejections are proper, or that the proposed modifications to the subject matter of Applicant's co-pending applications in view of one or more issued third-party patents are properly made or supported by the required teaching or motivation.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(f)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) by stating that Applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner said, "It is not clear who actually invented the subject matter of claims 1-5 and 19 because each of the above co-pending applications [referring to the co-pending applications cited to support the double patenting rejections] have different inventive entities." This rejection is traversed.

The inventors named in the present application are the inventors of the subject matter claimed in the present application. Multiple individuals are named as inventors because each individual made a contribution to the subject matter of at least one claim of the application, even though each individual may not have made the same type or amount of contribution and even though each individual may not have made a contribution to the subject matter of every claim in the application. Different inventive entities are named in a number of the co-pending applications cited by the Examiner because other individuals made contributions to the subject matter of at least one claim of each such application. The fact that inventive entities may be different in various applications does not mean that inventorship is incorrect in the present application. Often applications with overlapping subject matter but with additional disclosures and

differing sets of claims have different inventive entities. That is the situation here. The present application and the co-pending applications cited by the Examiner have disclosures and claims that differ and that require the naming of different inventive entities. Thus, there is no inconsistency in inventorship. Accordingly, Applicant requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,785,230 to Lokey or U.S. Patent No. 4,117,752 to Yoneda, in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,695,116 to Baur and U.S. Patent No. 5,606,889 to Bielinski. Applicant has studied the cited references in view of the rejected claims and the reasons expressed in the Office action. Applicant respectfully traverses and requests withdrawal of the rejections, at least because the cited references are not properly combined and because they fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in the above-identified claims.

The Examiner says that Lokey and Yoneda disclose the subject matter recited in claim 1 except for a braking system that includes one or more single-use components mounted in a cartridge that is removably coupled to a support frame. The Examiner cites Baur as disclosing that it is old and well-known to replace solenoids and electromagnetics with spring-loaded actuators that are electrically responsive by tensioned wires to provide fast-acting, less-expensive and smaller devices that provide large mechanical forces. The Examiner also cites Bielinski as disclosing that it is old and well-known to use spring-loaded actuators with fusible members that are contained in removable/replaceable cartridges so that users can quickly and easily replace used

cartridges with new ones. Therefore, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to modify the braking mechanisms of Lokey and Yoneda to remove the disclosed electromagnetics and solenoids and replace them with one or more single-use components that include fusible members.

Beginning initially with claim 1, claim 1 has been amended and is reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience.

1. (currently amended) A woodworking machine comprising:
a support frame including a work surface for supporting workpieces;
a cutting tool supported by the frame and movable relative to the work surface to cut the workpieces supported by the work surface; and
a safety brake system configured to detect a ~~dangerous condition~~contact between a person and the cutting tool, and to stop movement of the cutting tool upon detection of the ~~dangerous condition~~contact, wherein the safety brake system comprises:
a cartridge removably coupled to the support frame; and
one or more single-use components mounted in the cartridge and adapted to be used upon detection of the contact;
~~where the safety brake system includes one or more single-use components mounted in a cartridge removably coupled to the support frame.~~

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, as the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in original claim 1, much less amended claim 1. As amended, claim 1 is directed to a woodworking machine that includes, amongst other subject matter, a cutting tool and a safety brake system that is configured to detect contact between a person and the cutting tool. Amended claim 1 further recites that the safety brake system comprises a cartridge removably coupled to the support frame and one or more single-use components adapted to be used upon detection of the contact.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest this structure, regardless of whether the references are considered alone or in combination. As the Examiner correctly recognizes in the Office action, neither Lokey nor Yoneda disclose a safety brake system that includes a removable cartridge with one or more single-use components. The question, then, is whether the cited references to Baur or Bielinski disclose such a cartridge and whether there is sufficient teaching or motivation to modify the system of Lokey or Yoneda to include such a cartridge. As discussed in more detail herein, neither of these conditions is met.

As an initial matter, amended claim 1 recites that the safety brake system is adapted to detect contact between a person and a cutting tool. Lokey fails to disclose such a system, with Lokey instead being specifically directed to a proximity-detection system that stops the cutting tool before “even the slightest contact” between the person and the cutting tool. While Applicant reserves the right and its intent to resume prosecution of original claim 1 in a related application, amended claim 1 simply recites a safety brake system that operates upon a different mechanism than Lokey. As such, Applicant submits that the rejections that are based upon proposed modifications of Lokey to include the replaceable brake cartridge discussed herein are moot.

While Lokey fails to disclose and teaches away from a contact detection system, Applicant recognizes that Yoneda discloses a safety brake system that is claimed to detect contact between a person and a cutting tool. However, similar to Lokey and as recognized by the Examiner in the Office action, Yoneda also fails to disclose a safety brake system that includes at least one single-use component that is used upon detection of contact between the person and the cutting tool. Yoneda discloses a safety

system for a band saw, with the safety system including a pair of electromagnetic brakes – one (B) to stop the rotation of the saw's pulley and one (20) to stop movement of the saw's band blade. Nothing in Yoneda directly or even indirectly discloses or suggests that a component of the safety brake system is a single-use component in a cartridge.

In view of the above, the remaining question is then whether there is sufficient teaching or motivation in the other references to modify the system of Yoneda to obtain the subject matter recited in amended claim 1. Applicant submits that this teaching or suggestion is not only lacking, but also inappropriate, as Yoneda distinctly teaches away from the proposed modifications thereto.

Simply put, Yoneda describes a system that is designed for repeated uses and therefore does not include a replaceable cartridge or any single-use components. Modifying Yoneda as proposed by the Examiner would take away the multiple-use, unified system disclosed in Yoneda and replace it with a cartridge-based system that includes single-use components which must be replaced after a single use. There is no reason to make this change other than in an attempt to reconstruct the machine recited in original or pending claim 1, and doing so undermines and deviates from the disclosed system of Yoneda. For example, replaceable cartridges inherently need to be properly installed and positioned relative to the rest of the machine. If not, the brake system may not operate correctly. With the system disclosed in Yoneda, this is apparently not a concern because the system does not utilize replaceable cartridges. With the proposed modification, the Examiner has introduced into the system of Yoneda additional componentry and potential for failure. Similarly, with the inclusion of single-use

components comes the need to replace these components after every use so that the system is again ready for its intended purpose. The system disclosed in Yoneda does not require single-use components; instead it appears to be immediately ready for reuse after the system is actuated. As such, the system of Yoneda does not appear to require replacement of single-use components that were consumed when the brake system was actuated. In the proposed modification, however, this is not the case. Applicants submit that these examples illustrate that the proposed reconstruction of the system of Yoneda is contrary to and unsupported by the specific intent and disclosure of Yoneda. Therefore, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is fully supported by the MPEP and controlling case law. For example, in applying 35 U.S.C. § 103, the references must be considered as a whole and must suggest the desirability, and thus, the obviousness of making the combination. As stated by the Federal Circuit in In re Fritch, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992):

[T]he Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness based upon the prior art. 'The Examiner can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references.' ... Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. Although couched in terms of combining teaching found in the prior art, the same inquiry must be carried out in the context of a purported obvious 'modification' of the prior art. The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. ... This court has previously stated that '[o]ne cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the invention.' Id. at 1783-4.

Moreover, the references must be viewed without the benefit of impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention. Hodosh v. Block Drug Co., Inc., 786 F.2d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 1986). As such, the mere fact that the references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In the case at hand, there is no reason to make the proposed combination other than to reject amended claim 1.

Furthermore, the proposed modification destroys elements of Yoneda that are central to the operation and intended purpose of Yoneda. This latter fact demonstrates the clear lack of support for the proposed modification to the system of Yoneda. In other words, modifying Yoneda to have an increased chance of failure or require additional componentry to be operational as a safety system is contrary to the disclosure and intent of Yoneda. Under MPEP § 2143.01 and established case law, when evaluating whether there is sufficient suggestion or motivation to combine references, examiners must consider, among other factors, whether the prior art suggests the desirability of the claimed invention, whether the proposed modification renders the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, and whether the proposed combination changes a principle of operation of a reference. See In re Linter, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972); In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984); In re Ratti, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).

For at least the above reasons, Applicant requests that the rejection of amended claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Claims 2-11 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and therefore should be allowed when amended claim 1 is allowed. For the

purpose of brevity, and in view of the numerous reasons presented above why amended claim 1 should be allowed, each of these dependent claims and each additional reason why these claims should be allowed are not being presented in this response. However, Applicant wants to briefly identify a few of these dependent claims and mention illustrative additional reasons why these claims patentably distinguish the cited references.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in light of the above combinations of Lokey or Yoneda, as modified by Baur and Bielinski, and as further modified by U.S. Patent No. 5,082,316 to Wardlaw. The Examiner correctly recognizes that the devices of Lokey and Yoneda, even as modified in view of Baur and Bielinski, fail to disclose a firing system that utilizes a capacitor. However, the Examiner states that it would be further obvious to modify these devices to include a capacitor, with Wardlaw being cited as providing the required teaching or motivation to make this additional modification. Applicant traverses and requests that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn, not only for the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, but also because there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references to make the proposed modification. Simply put, the desire for a firing system that includes a capacitor, as set forth in the Office action, is not present in the references themselves. Instead, it is only arises after the cited references are selectively combined to destroy the multiple-use system of Yoneda and replace it with a cartridge-based system with one or more single-use components. Applicant submits that this does not and cannot provide the required teaching or suggestion. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lokey or Yoneda, in view of Baur and Bielinski, in view of the Official Notice taken by the Examiner that is old and well-known to replace brakes and springs when they are worn out to maintain the effectiveness of a brake system of a cutting tool. In view of this Notice, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to further modify the devices of Lokey and Yoneda to make replaceable fusible cartridges that include a brake spring to maintain the effectiveness of the braking system.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 6-8. Amended claim 1 recites that the one or more single-use components are adapted to be used upon detection of the contact between the person and the cutting tool. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that in any machine it is possible for a component to wear out or otherwise require maintenance from time to time. However, this is distinctly different from a single-use component that would need to be replaced after a single use. A brake system cartridge with one or more such single-use components, much less a woodworking machine that removably receives the same, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited references. The Official Notice taken by the Examiner similarly is not directed to single-use components that would have to be replaced after use, much less the required teaching or suggestion to reconstruct the system of Yoneda to include such a component. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicant requests that the basis for this modified notice be provided.

New claims 20-27 depend from amended claim 1 and therefore should be allowed when claim 1 is allowed.

New Claim 20 recites that the one or more single-use components include at least two single-use components that are formed from different materials and have different constructions. As the cited references fail to disclose a woodworking machine with a brake system having a cartridge with one single-use component, it follows that they fail to disclose such a system in which the cartridge includes two or more different single-use components.

New claim 23 depends from claim 1 and recites that the cutting tool includes a cutting surface and that at least one of the single-use components is adapted to engage the cutting surface of the cutting tool to stop the cutting tool after detection of the contact. Yoneda discloses a brake system that utilizes an electromagnetic brake to selectively engage the lateral sides of a band blade to stop the blade. This brake (20), and well as the other disclosed brake (B) in Yoneda both fail to engage the cutting surface of the cutting tool and instead are designed to engage other components of the machine. Therefore, regardless of whether the proposed modifications are made, Yoneda still fails to disclose or suggest a component, much less a single-use component that would have to be replaced after use, that engages the cutting surface of the machine's cutting tool. Applicant further submits that modifying Yoneda to include a brake that engages the cutting surface of the band blade or other cutting tool is contrary to the disclosure of Yoneda. For example, it removes the apparent ability of the disclosed system to be used multiple times without consumption of any component of the system.

New claim 27 depends from claim 6 and recites that the brake pawl and the cartridge includes concentric bores that are adapted to couple the cartridge and the

brake pawl to the support frame for pivotal movement relative to each other after the contact is detected. None of the cited references disclose a brake cartridge that includes one or more single-use component, much less such a component in which the cartridge and a brake pawl are coupled to the machine via concentric bores about which the pawl and cartridge move relative to each other during use of the brake system.

New claim 28 is an independent claim reciting among its limitations “a safety brake means.” That limitation is written in means-plus-function format and therefore must be interpreted under 35 U.S.C. §112 to cover the corresponding structure disclosed in the specification and equivalents. The cited references fail to disclose any such structure or equivalents.

Withdrawn Claims

Applicant requests that withdrawn claims 2 and 10-11 be reinstated when claim 1 is allowed because they depend from claim 1.

With the entry of the above amendments, and for the reasons discussed herein, Applicant submits that all of the issues raised in the Office action mailed December 22, 2003 have been addressed and overcome. If there are any remaining issues or if the Examiner has any questions, Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached at the number listed below. Similarly, if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview may be productive in advancing prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

SD3, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Fanning", is written over a horizontal line.

David A. Fanning, Esq.
Registration No. 33,233
Customer No. 27630
22409 S.W. Newland Road
Wilsonville, Oregon 97070
Telephone: (503) 638-6201
Facsimile: (503) 638-8601

Attachment 1

<u>Title</u>	<u>Serial No./ Publication No.</u>	<u>Filing Date/ Publication Date</u>
Detection System For Power Equipment	09/929,426 2002-0017176-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Contact Detection System For Power Equipment	60/225,200	August 14, 2000
Apparatus And Method For Detecting Dangerous Conditions In Power Equipment	09/929,221 2002-0017336-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Apparatus And Method For Detecting Dangerous Conditions In Power Equipment	60/225,211	August 14, 2000
Firing Subsystem For Use In A Fast-Acting Safety System	09/929,240 2002-0020263-A1	August 13, 2001 February 21, 2002
Firing Subsystem For Use In A Fast-Acting Safety System	60/225,056	August 14, 2000
Spring-Biased Brake Mechanism For Power Equipment	09/929,227 2002-0020271-A1	August 13, 2001 February 21, 2002
Spring-Biased Brake Mechanism For Power Equipment	60/225,170	August 14, 2000
Brake Mechanism For Power Equipment	09/929,241 2002-0017180-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Brake Mechanism For Power Equipment	60/225,169	August 14, 2000
Retraction System For Use In Power Equipment	09/929,242 2002-0017181-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Retraction System For Use In Power Equipment	60/225,089	August 14, 2000
Replaceable Brake Mechanism For Power Equipment	09/929,236 2002-0020261-A1	August 13, 2001 February 21, 2002
Replaceable Brake Mechanism For Power Equipment	60/225,201	August 14, 2000
Brake Positioning System	09/929,244 2002-0017182-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Brake Positioning System	60/225,212	August 14, 2000
Logic Control For Fast-Acting Safety System	09/929,237 2002-0020262-A1	August 13, 2001 February 21, 2002
Logic Control For Fast-Acting Safety System	60/225,059	August 14, 2000

<u>Title</u>	<u>Serial No./ Publication No.</u>	<u>Filing Date/ Publication Date</u>
Motion Detecting System For Use In A Safety System For Power Equipment	09/929,234 2002-0017178-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Motion Detecting System For Use In A Safety System For Power Equipment	60/225,094	August 14, 2000
Translation Stop For Use In Power Equipment	09/929,425 2002-0017175-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Translation Stop For Use In Power Equipment	60/225,210	August 14, 2000
Translation Stop For Use In Power Equipment	60/233,459	September 18, 2000
Cutting Tool Safety System	09/929,226 2002-0017183-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Cutting Tool Safety System	60/225,206	August 14, 2000
Table Saw With Improved Safety System	09/929,235 2002-0017184-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Table Saw With Improved Safety System	60/225,058	August 14, 2000
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	09/929,238 2002-0017179-A1	August 13, 2001 February 14, 2002
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	60/225,057	August 14, 2000
Fast Acting Safety Stop	60/157,340	October 1, 1999
Safety Systems For Power Equipment	09/676,190	September 29, 2000
Fast-Acting Safety Stop (Taiwan)	143466	February 25, 2002
Fast-Acting Safety Stop	60/182,866	February 16, 2000
Safety Systems for Power Equipment (PCT)	PCT/US00/26812	September 29, 2000
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	10/052,806 2002-0059855-A1	January 16, 2002 May 23, 2002
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	60/270,942	February 22, 2001
Contact Detection System For Power Equipment	10/053,390 2002-0069734-A1	January 16, 2002 June 13, 2002
Contact Detection System For Power Equipment	60/270,011	February 20, 2001

<u>Title</u>	<u>Serial No./ Publication No.</u>	<u>Filing Date/ Publication Date</u>
Power Saw With Improved Safety System	10/052,273 2002-0059853-A1	January 16, 2002 May 23, 2002
Power Saw With Improved Safety System	60/270,941	February 22, 2001
Table Saw With Improved Safety System	10/052,705 2002-0056350-A1	January 16, 2002 May 16, 2002
Table Saw With Improved Safety System	60/273,177	March 2, 2001
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	10/052,274 2002-0059854-A1	January 16, 2002 May 23, 2002
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	60/273,178	March 2, 2001
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	10/050,085 2002-0056349-A1	January 14, 2002 May 16, 2002
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	60/273,902	March 6, 2001
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	10/047,066 2002-0056348-A1	January 14, 2002 May 16, 2002
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	60/275,594	March 13, 2001
Safety Systems For Power Equipment	60/275,595	March 13, 2001
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	10/051,782 2002-0066346-A1	January 15, 2002 June 6, 2002
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	60/279,313	March 27, 2001
Safety Systems for Power Equipment	10/100,211 2002-0170399-A1	March 13, 2002 November 21, 2002
Safety Systems For Power Equipment	60/275,583	March 13, 2001
Router With Improved Safety System	10/197,975 2003-0015253-A1	July 18, 2002 January 23, 2003
Router With Improved Safety System	60/306,202	July 18, 2001
Translation Stop For Use In Power Equipment	09/955,418 2002-0020265-A1	September 17, 2001 February 21, 2002
Translation Stop For Use In Power Equipment	60/292,081	May 17, 2001
Band Saw With Improved Safety System	10/146,527 2002-0170400-A1	May 15, 2002 November 21, 2002
Band Saw With Improved Safety System	60/292,100	May 17, 2001

<u>Title</u>	<u>Serial No./ Publication No.</u>	<u>Filing Date/ Publication Date</u>
Apparatus And Method For Detecting Dangerous Conditions In Power Equipment	10/172,553 2002-0190581-A1	June 13, 2002 December 19, 2002
Apparatus And Method For Detecting Dangerous Conditions In Power Equipment	60/298,207	June 13, 2001
Discrete Proximity Detection System	10/189,031 2003-0002942-A1	July 2, 2002 January 2, 2003
Discrete Proximity Detection System	60/302,937	July 2, 2001
Actuators for Use in Fast-Acting Safety Systems	10/189,027 2003-0005588-A1	July 2, 2002 January 9, 2003
Actuators For Use In Fast-Acting Safety Systems	60/302,916	July 3, 2001
Actuators For Use In Fast-Acting Safety Systems	10/205,164 2003-0020336-A1	July 25, 2002 January 30, 2003
Actuators For Use In Fast-Acting Safety Systems	60/307,756	July 25, 2001
Safety Systems for Power Equipment	10/215,929 2003-0037651	August 9, 2002 February 27, 2003
Safety Systems For Power Equipment	60/312,141	August 13, 2001
Safety Systems For Band Saws	10/202,928 2003-0019341-A1	July 25, 2002 January 30, 2003
Safety Systems For Band Saws	60/308,492	July 27, 2001
Router With Improved Safety System	10/251,576 2003-0056853-A1	September 20, 2002 March 27, 2003
Router With Improved Safety System	60/323,975	September 21, 2001
Logic Control With Test Mode For Fast-Acting Safety System	10/243,042 2003-0058121-A1	September 13, 2002 March 27, 2003
Logic Control With Test Mode For Fast-Acting Safety System	60/324,729	September 24, 2001
Detection System for Power Equipment	10/292,607 2003-0090224-A1	November 12, 2002 May 15, 2003
Detection System For Power Equipment	60/335,970	November 13, 2001

<u>Title</u>	<u>Serial No./ Publication No.</u>	<u>Filing Date/ Publication Date</u>
Apparatus and Method for Detecting Dangerous Conditions in Power Equipment	10/345,630 2003-0131703-A1	January 15, 2003 July 17, 2003
Safety Systems For Power Equipment	60/349,989	January 16, 2002
Brake Pawls for Power Equipment	10/341,260 2003-0140749-A1	January 13, 2003 July 31, 2003
Brake Pawls For Power Equipment	60/351,797	January 25, 2002
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	10/643,296	August 18, 2003
Miter Saw With Improved Safety System	60/406,138	August 27, 2002
Retraction System And Motor Position For Use With Safety Systems For Power Equipment	60/452,159	March 5, 2003
Table Saws With Safety Systems And Blade Retraction	60/496,550	August 20, 2003
Brake Cartridges For Power Equipment	60/496,574	August 20, 2003
Switch Box For Power Tools With Safety Systems	60/533,598	December 31, 2003
Motion Detection System For Use In A Safety System for Power Equipment	60/496,568	August 20, 2003
Improved Detection Systems For Power Equipment	60/533,791	December 31, 2003
Improved Fence For Table Saws	60/533,852	December 31, 2003
Improved Table Saws With Safety Systems	60/533,811	December 31, 2003
Brake Cartridges And Mounting Systems For Brake Cartridges	60/533,575	December 31, 2003
Improved Table Saws With Safety Systems and Systems to Mount and Index Attachments	60/540,377	January 29, 2004